

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 691

EA 024 143

AUTHOR Papalewis, Rosemary; And Others
TITLE Mentor Development: A Model of Collaboration.
Implementation of the Danforth Project at CSU,
Fresno.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association (San
Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports -
Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Role;
*Collegiality; Cultural Differences; Elementary
Secondary Education; *Interprofessional Relationship;
Leadership Training; Management Development;
*Mentors; *Professional Development; Women
Administrators
IDENTIFIERS *California (San Joaquin Valley)

ABSTRACT

Outcomes of a mentoring-based preservice training program for educational administrators, the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals, are described in this paper. Components of the program included field-based experiential learning, educational collaboration, and mentoring with experienced administrators. Phase 1 involved the administration of a pretraining questionnaire to 18 mentoring dyads from 11 public school districts in San Joaquin Valley, California, to measure the amount and quality of mentoring activity. Phase 2 involved participation in a training workshop that tracked the mentors' and proteges' development. The third phase collected data through administration of a protege needs survey, interviews conducted with proteges and mentors, and analysis of both groups' journals. Proteges and mentors both expressed positive experiences, but proteges reported cultural and gender differences that hampered communication and satisfaction. (37 references) (LMI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED347691

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Papalewis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mentor Development:
A Model of Collaboration

*Implementation of the
Danforth Project*

at

CSU, Fresno

by

Rosemary Papalewis, Ed.D.
Co-director, CSUF-UC Joint Doctoral Program
in Educational Leadership
CSU, Fresno

Michael Jordan
Lecturer
CSU, Fresno

Alfredo Cuellar, Ph. D.
Associate Professor
CSU, Fresno

Diane M. Yerkes, Ed.D.
Associate Professor
CSU, Fresno

A contributed research paper presented at the meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, CA, April, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 2

EA 084 143

Introduction

The mentor/protege relationship has become a topic of rapidly developing interest over the past few years. Much of the research that has been done and is now being done addresses the characteristics and development of these relationships. Researchers (Alleman, 1984; Auster, 1984; Daresh, 1989; Kay & Gerhrke, 1984; Papalewis, 1988) are interested in the advantages and disadvantages associated with these relationships and with the problems of mentoring, both for the mentor and the protege. This has provided the basis for studies relating to the effectiveness of such relationships and how they might be controlled and nurtured from inception to termination.

The earliest definitions of mentor are derived from Greek legends (Auster, 1984) which speak of Odysseus entrusting his son to the care of his friend and teacher, Mentor, while he embarked on his mythical journeys. Skeats' (1980) Etymological Dictionary traces the beginnings of *protege* to the Latin word *protege* which meant "to protect." Generally we think of the protege as one who is protected or helped, especially in the advancement of his/her career, by another, more influential person.

Much of the work by researchers today (Alleman, 1984; Clawson, 1985) deals with a more contemporary definition of the mentor/protege relationship. The modern day concept is found to be one which many feel can be manipulated and controlled, even by elements outside the mentor-/protege relationship. Schein (1978) and a group of his students from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found mentoring to fulfill many roles. These included teacher, coach, positive role model, developer of talent, opener of doors, protector, sponsor, and successful leader. Their work has been validated by subsequent researchers in the field, namely Clawson (1985), Kay and Gerhke (1984), and Levinson (1978).

Clawson's (1985) findings indicate that most of the mentor/protege relationships develop

as a means to advance in the workplace. Those being mentored are mostly interested in the job-related aspect of the relationships, rather than the emulation of lifestyles and personal ideals. He views most of the learning which takes place in these relationships as superior-subordinate based as opposed to mentoring in the truest sense.

Other researchers (Auster, 1984; Levinson, 1978), through an interest in the dyadic nature of the relationships, see a great deal of mutual benefit for both participants. Levinson's study indicated that the mentor/protege relationship is of particular help in making the transition to "achievable dreams." It is his belief that the relationship in its healthiest form is mutually beneficial, with the mentors taking pride in their proteges' achievements and in having their own work benefit from the proteges' energies and talents. The protege grows and learns from her/his model's experience and is assisted to even higher levels of responsibility as the mentor opens doors.

Auster (1984) describes the mentor/protege relationship as a unique role set, because of its dyadic character. He sees this dyadic quality as the fundamental and distinctive feature of the mentor/protege relationship and finds that it is generally evaluated as a rewarding relationship for both participants. This stands in agreement with Levinson's (1984) findings. Auster (1984) also found that benefits reported by proteges themselves included more challenges to clearer thinking and greater opportunities for career success. Most proteges seem to feel that almost anyone can dispense social rewards, but the praise of a "significant other" is worth more to the recipient, even though the time and effort involved might be the same from the non-mentoring personality as from the mentoring one.

Many researchers (Alleman, 1982, 1984; Glassman, 1984; Ouchi, 1981) have approached the subject of investigating what might underlie the motivational aspects of mentoring, searching for what might hold as "common" characteristics for the mentor/protege relationship.

Alleman (1982) discusses three major points concerning just such an investigation:+

1. Do mentors exhibit certain behaviors that distinguish them from their non-mentoring colleagues?
2. Do mentors have certain personality characteristics that distinguish them for selection to perform mentoring functions?
3. Is it necessary to "match" certain people together for successful mentoring to occur?

Alleman chose 29 protégé-labeled mentoring pairs and 21 subordinate-labeled non-mentoring pairs working within an organization. The study utilized a *Superior-Subordinate Activities Questionnaire* developed in a pilot study to measure frequency of occurrence of specific mentoring behaviors within pairs. *The Jackson Personality Inventory* (Jackson, 1976) measured psychological characteristics. The JPI, the *Biographical Information Questionnaire* (pilot study), and the *Adjective Checklist* (Gough & Heilbrun, 1965) were used to measure similarities within dyads.

Her research delving into these areas has concluded the following:

Mentors do indeed display specific actions and attitudes more often than the members of a comparison group. This recognition of a difference in behaviors of the mentor group is expressed both by the members of the mentor group and by the members of the group being acted upon. A particularly interesting finding of Alleman's 1982 study is that these behavioral differences are present and exist over and above the effects of sex, race, or gender combinations within dyads or perceived organizational policies on the treatment of subordinates. The study, contrary to the unsupported speculation in the literature, indicated that behavior patterns in mentoring relationships did not vary with sex. Male and female mentors treated their protégés in the same way. Mentoring occurs in a wide variety of organizational types and in varying settings and functions within each individual organization. *The difference between mentors and non-mentors is found in what they*

do, not who they are. Alleman and others (Alleman, Cochran, Doverspide & Newman, 1984) find, therefore, that the evidence indicates that mentoring relationships can be established or enriched by learning or encouraging mentor-like behavior rather than by selecting certain types of people, and that it is not necessary to cross-match pairs on various characteristics or to avoid cross-gender pairing.

The concept of designating individuals to serve as mentors as part of preservice training programs for educational administrators has now become a focal point of many recent reform efforts in administrative training programs across the nation. One such program is the Danforth Foundation Program for the Preparation of School Principals, established in 1987 as a way to serve those advancing through the administrative career field. These innovative programs would allow them to experience a type of pre-service training that was somehow different from the more traditional methodologies. According to the precepts established by the Danforth Program, the training would emphasize learning through field experience rather than the more clinical approach of conventional classroom settings. There was also to be included in the Danforth formula a close collaboration between the participating universities and local school administrative systems. And finally there was the selection of individual experienced administrators to serve as mentors for selected candidates participating in the administrative pre-service training program. The goal of this program was to assist new administrators in becoming as effective as successful as possible as soon as possible, and to ease the entry into a demanding profession for novice administrators.

Research (Alleman, 1989; Gillispie, 1989) indicates that trained mentors have dramatically higher mentoring activity and their proteges credit the mentoring they receive with significantly higher levels of career benefit and personal development. This specific program trained mentors to sponsor, coach, share information, protect, role model, counsel, encourage, and foster independence in the protege. Secondly, program intended to enable mentors to effectively prepare

underrepresented administrators. Lack of culturally diverse insight and understanding tends to perpetuate the traditional models of administration.

The importance of having a mentor is well documented. Findings, though, are not consistent that gender, race, or ethnicity of mentor/protege dyads have an effect on the relationship. Gilligan (1982) wrote that the images of hierarchy and web, drawn from the texts of men's and women's fantasies and thoughts, convey different views of morality and self. Likewise, McIlhenny and Bennington (1990) and Miller (1984) concluded that in adult development, academic and career development do not always agree on whether the mentor should be male or female. These researchers found that though some say women should mentor women, still others contend that men should mentor women due to their generally more elevated status of males in the professions. They also suggested that because women develop differently, that researchers should question the advisability to judging the effectiveness of "traditional mentoring" on the individual development of adult females based on research conducted only on males.

Literature specific to female mentoring relationships suggest that:

- (1) Very often women were unaware that their first relationship was a mentoring relationship (Jewell, 1990);
- (2) often women do not trust the mentoring relationship until proof of attaining the professional goal is made, such as getting a desired position, graduating, etc. (Papalewis, 1983);
- (3) women who had been mentored had established a career direction of demonstrated competence before the benefactor appeared (Jewell, 1990);
- (4) women who had advanced in their careers without a patron traveled as rapidly, but did it with greater self-doubt (Jewell, 1990);
- (5) cross-sex mentoring relationships for women have considerable potential to be exploitive and that the introduction of sex and sexuality into mentoring relationships has a distinctively negative impact on equitable opportunities (La France, 1987; Paludi, 1987);
- (6) mentored women felt that "success and power" were one and the same thing, therefore increasing their sense of personal empower-

ment (Jewell, 1990); (7) being a mentor and helping to develop the careers of others can affect a woman's career in some of the same positive ways as having a mentor (Schaeffer, 1984); (8) women mentors can increase women's identification with successful role models, provide valuable information, and create incentives through illustrative success (Haring-Hidore, 1987); (9) women see mentoring responsibilities as relationships which encourage not only career development, but also emotional development and well-being (Keele & DeLa Mare-Schaeffer, 1984; O'Leary, 1988).

Likewise, and in spite of the rapidly growing interest in mentoring and the abundance of titles dealing with various mentoring topics (Miles, 1989), the nature of mentoring experiences among minorities, and the characteristics and development of these relationships have not attracted the attention of researchers. The experience of minorities in administrative careers is an important body of knowledge to document. In a comprehensive study about minority school administrators, Valverde and Brown (1988) reported that administrators from minority ethnic groups have to overcome an unusual variety of demands and expectations placed on them: stereotyping and segregation, gaining much needed experience, responding to minority constituents, demonstrating loyalty to superior administrators and teachers, explaining dysfunctional practices of school districts in the education of minorities, and helping district personnel to understand what is important to minority groups.

Literature specific to race or ethnicity mentoring relationships suggest that: (1) grooming-mentoring works best if the relationship is homogeneous (Haring-Hidore, 1987); (2) homogeneity is problematic as finding mentors poses special difficulties for the culturally diverse (Haring-Hidore, 1987; Hodkinson, 1970); (3) a plea for "womentoring" from a cross-cultural perspective, that white women have attained positional power should mentor non-white women (Hetherington & Barcelo, 1985); (4) though mentoring experiences have been found to be similar regardless of

race, some researchers have acknowledged that this experience may have greater impact on the career of African-Americans (Alleman, Newman, Huggins, & Carr, 1987); (5) mentors of the same ethnicity as their proteges appear to be more sensitive in responding to career development issues (DeFour, 1990); (6) minority proteges prefer as role models members of the same ethnicity or that being unavailable, Caucasians.

Methodology

Subjects: Eighteen dyads have been identified from eleven public school districts located in the San Joaquin Valley, California.

Dyads are:	18 dyads from 11 public school districts
	9 dyads male mentor/female protege
	5 dyads male mentor/male protege
	3 dyads female mentor/female protege
	1 dyad female mentor/male protege
Mentors:	17 mentors (1 mentor has 2 proteges)
	13 mentors are Caucasian male
	4 mentors are Caucasian female
Proteges:	12 females 9 Caucasian, 3 Hispanic
	6 males 2 Caucasian, 3 Hispanic, 1 Asian-American

Phase 1

Selection of the Mentors: The mentors were recommended by the District Superintendents based on the following criteria, with no relevance attached to cardinal position (Papalewis, 1978b):

1. Is a good motivator
2. Is a good teacher
3. Is a high performer
4. Is secure in his/her position
5. Is not threatened by others' successes
6. Is able to give the protege exposure
7. Is reflective of the District's values
8. Is in touch with the District's culture

Pre-training Steps: The level of mentoring activity before training was measured for two reasons (Alleman, 1989). First, it served as a baseline measure for before and after comparisons. Second, it provided the information needed to give individual feedback to individual mentors during training. This measurement, as well as the follow-up measurement, was made with the *Alleman Mentoring Scales Questionnaire*. It is a reliable, valid instrument that measures the amount and quality of mentoring activity. Reliability = .99 ($p < .001$); six types of validity range from .52 to .89 ($p < .01$) and ($p < .001$).

The pre-training components of this study were:

Administer *Alleman Mentoring Scales Questionnaire, Forms A and B*, and *The Mentoring Styles Indicator for Educational Administrators* (Gray and Anderson, 1990).

The pre-training data was gathered at the initial training session in September, 1990 before the training session began. All proteges filled out *Form B* of the instrument, which describes their mentor's actions toward them. The mentors filled out *Form A*, which describes their own actions toward their proteges. Two profiles were drawn for each relationship and used later in training. *The Mentoring Styles Indicator* was also administered as a pretraining instrument as was a protege needs survey.

Phase 2

Training: Preparation of the mentors was to familiarize them with both the techniques of mentoring and the overall goals of the mentoring program. Likewise, the protege should understand the capabilities of formal mentoring and its limitations.

Initial training for the mentors and proteges was provided by Marilyn Gray of *The International Centre for Mentoring*, Vancouver, British Columbia. The workshop included an orientation to the goals of the program as well as more in-depth training and participative activities in the following areas:

- Mentoring in the career development continuum
- Basic differences between mentoring and coaching
- Why a planned mentoring is needed

Inadequacies of informal mentoring

Research results on gender and cultural differences

Essential components of a planned mentoring program

- mentoring style as assessed by the *Mentoring Style Indicator*
- Roles mentors play
- Protege needs

The training components of this study were:

1. Tracking the Danforth Proteges development noting

- their formal mentor relationship
- self-described feelings, insights, problems encountered. etc.
- informal mentor relationships (if any)
- self-described development from teacher to administrator
- identified strategies used for interacting with colleagues
- perceived similarities/differences due to gender, ethnicity or race

2. Tracking the Danforth Mentors development noting

- their formal protege relationship
- self-described feelings, insights, problems encountered, etc.
- self-description of their mentoring style
- self-described best techniques that work with their protege
- perceived similarities/differences due to gender, ethnicity or race

Phase 3

Data Collection: Data was collected and is being analyzed from the *Alleman Mentoring Scales Questionnaire, Forms A & B*, from *The Mentoring Styles Indicator for Educational Administrators* Gray and Anderson, 1990), a protege needs survey, structured interviews with both proteges and mentors and reflective writing journals from proteges and mentors.

Outcomes

Mentor behaviors identified in Proteges journals in an assigned formal mentor relationship

Table 1

- Strong command of communication skills
- Shared insights on performance skills
- The ability to laugh at yourself
- Openness and willingness to share ideas
- Willingness to share time
- Introduces the protege to the "inside workings"
- A calming, supportive influence
- Spends a lot of his/her time allowing me to apply what I am learning
- Spends a great deal of time guiding, directing and explaining
- Is willing to let me take on the responsibilities I feel capable and confident enough to handle
- Provides relaxed time for brainstorming, discussing, laughing, crying and growing
- Helps protege to understand that much of what is felt is not abnormal for this change

Table 2

Some examples of protege journal comments describing mentoring relationships:

- Without the support, encouragement, faith and friendship of my mentor, I would have thrown the whole internship down the drain. She is a class act both professionally and personally. We are a unique and special "two-some"...and have developed a true and sincere friendship.
- Allows me to observe, act or whatever I feel comfortable with at the time
- Gives me no positive feedback on my performance. I guess no news is good news. I know I probably should ask him about my performance, but I am working so hard that I would be deflated if I only heard the response, "fine."
- I am given the bulk of the workload. My mentor says he gives it to me because I get it done! I guess that is a compliment. Memos of responsibility addressed to other workers are left on my desk for completion.
- My mentor was supportive, but gave no input on different ways to implement. The whole time I felt he was extremely distracted and that I was taking up valuable time.
- Mentor is a great support on how to handle people in different situations.
- He thinks I'm doing a good job - but it's hard to tell, he never expresses his feelings.
- She wrote me a note saying how much she appreciated my organization, eagerness, etc.
- There is always time for the program and me, she will always make time for me.
- He supported my authority in decision-making.
- I was elated when he actually asked my opinion!
- I felt for a moment we were actually colleagues discussing a curriculum problem rather than the boss/subordinate relationship.

Table 3

How mentors have described their proteges (journal excerpts):

- My feeling is that he is very much child-centered and sensitive. Qualities I find essential in those administering programs for children and youth.
- He exhibits sensitivity coupled with tenacity.
- I appreciate his willingness to handle hostile situations and to see two sides of an issue.
- He understood his assignment and was committed to fulfilling his duties.
- He handled the situation efficiently and with diplomacy.
- As a trainer, he is enthusiastic, motivating personal and well-prepared.
- I received compliments about her ability to keep the meeting moving.
- My protege keeps telling me that it was OK to get his feet wet, but not to be pushed into the ocean already! I felt that was a though-provoking comment...
- I find my protege coming to me less and less for decisions. She's making a lot of them herself.(mid February)
- I saw some real skills being developed as she handled potentially controversial issues with the teachers.
- I think she has really grown professionally in the area of administration. She has been a pleasure to work with. I have greatly benefited as well by having her to discuss controversial issues with.

Table 4

Protege Interviews: Samples of struggling with mentors and developing informal mentoring relationships.

*(F) One thing I see is that the mentors are going to say, I shouldn't say all of them, but as far as mine is concerned, she's going to say everything is fine and hunky-dory because that's what I tell her. Because I don't know how to respond to her when she says "What's really going on?" I don't know how much I should dump on them because they are my next in command. They expect an awful lot from us too, I think. They say, "Well, here's the budget, here's the site plan and it's yours and you have ten weeks to get it done." And they hand it to you and you're sitting there looking at it going "OK, now what am I going to do with this?" I kinda feel like I'm out there looking at this think, yeah sink or swim. And it's not that I don't have time to do it, nobody sat down with me and explained to me that this is what you are supposed to do to get to this point.

*(F) You know what I found most frustrating initially with the mentor was hearing from about five people in here what sound like wonderful mentors, I mean truly mentors. Hearing their stories and knowing that we weren't getting even a fourth of that. That was really frustrating. So I had to stop and change my ideas of what I was supposed to get out of it and look at the mentor's strengths and zero in on that. Basically I'm making the decisions on what I'm going to be working on and doing. He said take the initiative, do whatever. So..I am. But I'm not getting the mentoring that I should in order to become a so-called administrator.

*(F) I think it depends mainly on the personality of the person you are working with. I have a site

administrator who I think is becoming a mentor to me. It's not only because she is at the site, but because I think as a person she is more open to the mentoring kind of role. It's that open attitude she has. With him (her assigned mentor), he'll say, "So...how is it going?" The look in his eye is "don't tell me anything bad, don't fill up with tears, don't give me that look." So I kinda choose my words more carefully with him, can't really let it all out. With her (site administrator), I feel I can just about say whatever I want to.

Table 5

Protege Interviews: Cultural or Gender differences as described by the proteges

*(M) As a Hispanic I am constantly, almost exclusively, given multicultural related tasks, affirmative action issues or minority topics. This prevents me from gaining needed experience in other administrative duties and prevents other staff members from gaining experience in dealing with minority affairs.

*(M) The difficult part is finding support from Hispanic teachers. Once you are performing administrative duties, many Hispanics refer to you in derogatory terms indicating that you have accepted the values and behaviors of the Anglo school culture'

*(F) I'm thinking back and I don't think I really had a mentor, but as I think back, my experience had always been with men and I did feel used. And never, and always felt that maybe you didn't get the credit that you deserved. And then those are some of the feelings that I remember having as I worked for different males. But then I worked for some real chauvinistic people and I'm not sure

that they were the..I think they were unusually chauvinistic and I don't think they were maybe the norm

*(F) You know I see a lot of what the expectation is for women is that you have to go this position, now you need to go this position, now you're getting trained and eventually if you get enough experience, you spend enough time, you can just immediately after 5 or 6 to 8 years move into this top position which is what you really want. You rarely see people go from here to here. But you do see men go from here to here

*(F) At the ASCD Conference I had the opportunity to hear a lady speak, I've forgotten her name. She was wonderful. I'll never forget what she said, "Women are promoted on performance, men are promoted on potential." I was hoping that that wasn't going to be the case, but I'm glad you shared that with us about that's exactly what you have been getting out there. What I'm hearing is women have to perform, perform, perform rather than saying, "Boy, she's got potential. Let's get her in there."

*(F) And I think that there is a generation of women, I think the next generation of women will not have to go through what we've gone through. And I say we, because now women really do have some rights and I think men...my Supt. I think he really likes women and I think he really values women and values the different point of view that comes from women. He doesn't always like what I say, but I think he values it. And because he does that he's going to value what other people say, and so I think that's breaking down.

*(F) I really have sort of two mentors. I'm on site with the woman and the official mentor is a man

and I really see such a difference in the way we communicate. Because, the woman, we just both throw out things, just throw them out and talk them back and forth. Where he tends to be bottom line right away. Let's go right to the bottom line. And it kind of ends the conversation, it doesn't share as well. And, it's just the way it goes and that's the way it will be when we communicate.

*(F) What comes back to you as the protege, and I don't think it's intentional, but from the woman comes back to you "I'm hearing what you're saying and this is how I am responding. I'm hearing what you are giving to me and I'll throw it back to you, and I want to hear again what you have to say." That's kind of how it opens. But with the male, I don't feel the assurance that he heard what I said. You see...I know he did, that is not his intention...you learn that, and I don't mean to say it is. But that's the feeling you get back. There's the discomfort that "But did you really hear what I said?" because there's no affirmation of that, I ..

*(F) You know an issue that I think we ought to discuss is there's something the males have control over that we don't and that's the political system. I don't know how many of you understand it, because now I work for an elected official which is a little different from working in a district, however, politics in any district is always important and men have clues about politics that we just don't have. As a teacher did you think of yourself as a political person? I didn't either initially, but we learn the games, we work in the political arena, we respond to legislation and so we really need to know that system. And I find it very frustrating that it is the hardest system to get a handle on, it's totally inconsistent, as I...

References:

- Alleman, E. (1982). Mentoring research results. Mentor, OH. Leadership Development Consultants, Inc.
- Alleman, E. (1989). Two planned mentoring programs that worked. Mentoring International, 3 (1), 6-12.
- Alleman, E. , Cochran, J., Doverspike, J., & Newman, I.,(1984). Enriching Mentoring Relationships. The Personnel and Guidance Journal. 62, 329-332.
- Alleman, E., Newman, I, Huggins, H., and Carr, L. . (1987). The impact of race on mentoring relationships. International Journal of Mentoring, 1, (2).
- Auster, D. (1984). Mentors and protégés: power-dependent dyads. Sociological Inquiry. 54(2), 142-153
- Clawson, J.G. (1980). Is mentoring necessary? Training and Developmental Journal. 39, 36-39.
- Cox, D. (1989). Mentor Teacher: an important school reform component. Thrust, Nov/Dec, 56-58
- Daresh, J. & Playko, M.(1989) . Teacher mentors and administrative mentors: same track, different trains. Journal For School Administrators, 20, 88-96.
- DeFour, D. (1990). Some thoughts on ethnic minority mentoring. International Journal of Mentoring, 1, (2):. 14-17.
- Dodges, J. (1987). Do women in education need mentors? Education Canada, Jan, 26-28,
- Gillespie, D.B., (1989). Implementing a mentoring program in life insurance companies. Mentoring International, 3 (1), 13-18.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Glassman, R. (1984). A sociobiological examination of management theory Z. Human Relations, 37, (5), 367-391.
- Gough, H.G. & Heilbrun, A.B. (1965). The adjective checklist manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gray, W. & Anderson, T. (1990). MSI mentoring style indicator for educational administrators. Canada: International Centre for Mentoring.
- Haring-Hidore, M. (1987). Mentoring as a career enhancement strategy for women. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66, 147-148.
- Hetherington, C. & Barcelo, R. (1985). Womentoring: A cross-cultural perspective. Journal of NAWDAC, 48, 12-15.
- Hodkinson, C. (1970). Organizational influence on value systems. Educational Administration Quarterly, 3, 46.
- Jackson, D.N., (1976). Jackson Personality Inventory Manual. Goshen, NY: Research Press.
- Jackson, D.N., (1977). Reliability of the Jackson personality inventory, Psychological Reports, 40, 613-614.
- Jewell, S. (1990). Mentors for women: career necessity or hype? Career Planning and Adult Development Journal, Summer, 13-15
- Kay, R. & Gehrke, N. (1984) Mentoring in the training and socialization of teachers. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Keele, R.L. & M. DeLamare-Schaeffer, (1984) So what do you do now that you didn't have a mentor? Journal of the National Association of Women's Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 47(2), 36-40.
- LaFrance, M. (1987). The Paradox of Mentoring. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Congress on Women, July. Dublin, Ireland.

- Levinson, D.J., Darrow, C., Klein, E., Levinson, M., McKee, B., (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Ballentine Books.
- McElhiney, A. & Bennington (1990). Genesis of a planned mentoring program for re-entry women. Career Planning and Adult Development Journal. Summer, 13-15
- Miles, M. G.. (Ed.), (1989). Mentoring and coaching: An annotated bibliography. Mentoring International 3, 20-23.
- Miller, J.B. (1984). The Development of Women's Sense of Self (work in progress). Wellesley, MA: Stone Center for developmental services and studies, Wellesley College.
- O'Leary (1988). Women's relationship with women in the workplace. In B.A. Gutek, A.H. Stromberg, & L. Larwood (eds.) Women and Work. Newbury Park, CA: Gray. 189-214.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.
- Paludi M. & Hidore-Haring M. (1987). Sexuality and sex in mentoring and tutoring: implications for women's opportunities and achievement. Peabody Journal of Education, Summer, 164-171.
- Papalewis, R. (1983). The mentoring relationship between major advisors and doctoral degree advisees. University Microfilms International, DAQ 56766, 300 North ZEEB Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48196.
- Papalewis, R. (1987b). The relationship of selected variables to mentoring in doctoral level education. International Journal of Mentoring, 2 (1), 22-26.
- Papalewis, R. (1990). The Mentor Gender Communication Scale. CSU, Fresno: CA.
- Schein, E.H., (1978). Socialization and learning to work (ch.8). Career Dynamics: Matching Individuals and Organizational Needs. Reading, Mass.:Addison-Wesley.

Skeats, W. (1980). A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Perigree Books.

Valverde, L. A. , & Brown, F. (1988). Influences in leadership development among racial and ethnic minorities. In Boyan, N. (Ed.), Handbook of research on Educational Administration (pp.143-157). New York: Longman.